

CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance

Vol. XXXIV, No. 2

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper

February, 1983

ACTION ON ACADEMY

by ROSINE DE BOUNEVIALLE

There can be no doubt about the absolute priority given by would-be leaders of society to the establishment and maintenance of institutes dedicated to a process of indoctrination of the young euphemistically called education. Only a few weeks ago *Don Bell Reports* commented upon the rivalry in "educational" investment between those seemingly indestructible internationalists, Harriman and Hammer. We quote: "Could it be that Averell Harriman, monopoly capitalist and elder statesman to liberal Democrats, didn't want to be outdone by monopoly capitalist and Comrade to the Kremlin Politburo, Armand Hammer? Hammer contributed some \$4 million to date to establish the Armand Hammer United World College for the American West . . ." [The same that our very own Mountbattens, uncle and nephew, were and are so heavily involved in. Ed.] "So Averell Harriman has matched and even exceeded Hammer's contribution to the cause of the creation of future leaders of the New World Order. The 91-year-old friend of the Fabians has given \$11.5 million to Columbia University's Russian Studies Research Institute, this is the institute that was headed for years by Zbigniew Brzezinski until he was called by the Trilateral Commission to become President Carter's National Security Adviser." As Don Bell says, "It would be the height of asininity to believe that Harriman would donate \$11.5 million just so a few scholars could study the Russian language." He goes on to describe the banking - Communist - internationalist back-and-forwards of the Harrimans and Hammers along with the rest of "Our Crowd" whose dubiously be-gotten billions have financed the perversion of youth on a world scale.

Even such a comparatively short study of the trends of history and current events shows that the necessary imperative, "Go and teach all nations," is being successfully implemented by the forces of subversion in precise ratio to the degree of abandonment by liberal spokesmen of the Church's divinely ordered role in favour of sychophantic deference to misconceived heresies and opinions propounded by revolutionaries of every hue from rose madder to chrome yellow. From play-school onwards our youth

is being *conditioned to tolerate subversion*. Even the nursery is not safe if its resident mentors are themselves products of such "toleration ethics". Initially no more than toleration is needed. The little white rabbit depicted playing with the little black rabbit creates no comment in the kindergarten, and the ductility of the end product of such "threshold attack" is now only too evident.

That all this is no news to us is, alas, all too true but its very obviousness seems to have bred a disastrous tolerance of its own even among the alert. We have heard the fire alarm but we still hang about in the burning building waiting for someone to come and help us save some personal treasure, quite forgetting that arsonists do not usually telephone the fire brigade.

Candour and its readership appeared to be well aware of the danger inherent in the present state of public indoctrination when we suggested the establishment of a school for patriots. Readers responded with enthusiasm for the project, some contributing financially from limited resources. For three years come last October we have all patiently awaited developments.

Regretfully, we have now to tell you that the progenitors of that first project, so hopeful in the seventies, in the eighties have despaired of gathering a sufficiency of finance or even personnel — on both sides of the desk so to speak. Those hopes have foundered whilst the necessity for action has become more urgent than ever.

The establishment of a school for patriots was somewhat in the nature of a frontal attack for which the logistics have always been inadequate, but if prosecution of the war is to continue on our part of the line it will be no use waiting to "win the pools" before adopting some alternative method of advancing. The bad news is that that is exactly what we have been doing. The good news is that we have now decided on an alternative, and propose appropriate action for which we solicit your support. If the school is "out" then the academy must be "in". A contradiction in terms when one remembers that Plato's academy was a garden!

We have a garden, and to it we propose to invite the right (in all senses of the word) lecturers (for love, initially) and students (for a fee) to engage in studies and activities relevant to our cause — for weekly or fortnightly periods in spring, summer and autumn whenever a suitably balanced class presents itself.

If this latest venture is not to prove purely academic in the “unpractical” meaning of the term, we must have your enquiries, suggestions, offers of participation, and whatever cash you can bear to part with; and we shall all do better for remembering that the most enduring enterprise the world has yet seen was originally promoted by twelve inspired men in a market place. Let us pray that we shall do even half as well in a garden.

* *Don Bell Reports*, P. Box 2223, Palm Beech, Florida, U.S.A. 33480.

THE PRICE OF A LIFE

Anger rightly erupted when the driver responsible for the death of a teenage horse rider was fined a mere £75 and banned from the road for only one month for “careless driving” by Haywards Heath magistrates. Punkay Patel, one of our Commonwealth cousins who lives in Westbourne Park Road, London, had been travelling too fast in his lorry when he loomed up on the girl and her horse on a Sussex country road. Both were killed instantly.

After the hearing, the girl’s father described the sentence as “unjust and diabolical”. Life must be held to be cheap by the magistrates if the destruction in an instant of a little girl’s future is not worth more than £75. They also showed remarkable leniency in giving Patel a derisory period of disqualification. A longer ban, reported the Brighton *Evening Argus*, would have caused “hardship” to the immigrant’s business. Poor thing! Patel, it seems, had a previous conviction for the same offence. How grave were the consequences of *that*, we wonder?

*Patronise
the Academy
for Patriots*

QUIZ, QUAS OR QUILL-BE?

Is your problem ‘attitude’?
Have you ethnic pride?
Do you react to platitude,
Disdain the multi-racial ride?

Do you find unemployment
Rather hard to bear?
And fail to find enjoyment
In a colour-blind nightmare?

Are you brainwashed by the dustbin
Reflecting in your home
Ideas for you adjustin’
To the made-to-measure throne?

Do you wonder where has truth gone?
At morality’s decay?
Do you swallow television
From breakfast until you lay?

There were fairies at the bottom
Of the garden; and alas,
The melting-pot’s begotten
That such evil comes to pass.

Do you wonder, are you English?
Scottish or Cymric true?
Are you so bloody selfish
That you will not change your hue?

Once there were little children
Who grew to take their place
As the men and women
Of their now, enjoining, race.

O freedom democratic
For the con-men over us;
Obedient and lunatic
As we shuffle for the ‘bus.

But con-men they are mortal,
The tricksters are unmade;
Lies become abortal
With ‘race’ properly assayed.

B. E. BIGGS.

A. K. SPEAKS! Hear A. K. Chesterton’s hour-long talk on the menace of international finance and communism. Introduced by Leslie Green. £3 U.K., £5 overseas from Candour Publishing Co.

THE CANDOUR LIBRARY’S sale of second-hand books and journals has started. Send an s.a.e. for lists to The Candour Library, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire.

THE SHEEP ON GREENHAM COMMON

by JANUS

A cause often bears the imprint of those who serve it. Any cause that attracts such a preposterous harlequinade as the female (technically, they deserve the term) ban-the-bomb demonstrators who have plagued Greenham Common for more than a year belongs to a world that is lost and perhaps too pathetically imbecile even to be damned. As we go to press, 54 women have just been released from custody, having been arrested by military policemen for clambering over a 12 ft. perimeter fence at the R.A.F. base, wherein they pranced about and warbled left-wing songs of "peace" for more than an hour.

The Greenham Common base is no great distance from Forest House, and having had cause to drive past it a few times we can testify to the pathetic, weak-faced and bizarre appearance of the creatures attracted to the "peace camp". Filth and squalor also characterise the place — a gypsy encampment would look and smell sweeter. Quite what advantage Msgr. Bruce Kent thinks such a motley crew of exhibitionists brings to his already dubious cause baffles us. Newbury Council would be well advised, in the interest of the public's physical and mental health, to send several bull-dozers and corporation dust-carts to sweep the whole ghastly mess away!

Think how long an attempted anti-abortion camp would be allowed to set itself up beside a hospital, or an anti-immigration camp outside Heathrow Airport or the Commission for Racial Equality's headquarters. Far from receiving official support from the Labour Party, it *and* the Conservatives would be united to evict the protesters with all possible speed — no matter how "sincere", "committed" and "rational" the campers might be about *these* crucial issues.

Consequence Of Disarmament

Whatever the muddled motives of the campers on the Common — or those who take part in the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament — we have our doubts that many of them have pondered sufficiently deeply on what would be the result of their clamouring for unilateral disarmament. The Communist element, of course, who are quite thick on the C.N.D. ground, know precisely its ramifications. Peace between East and West is chiefly maintained by the fear each has of being devastated by nuclear warfare if it initiates fighting. This fear would be removed from only one side if the other dismantled its nuclear armoury. The consequence would be to make aggression by the side that did not disarm *more* likely, not less.

If the ban-the-bomb brigade think that an enemy would be so impressed with Britain's moral stand in disarming unilaterally that it would follow suit, then their minds have been divested of any semblance of reason. As Dean Inge's comment so succinctly put it: "It is useless for the sheep to pass resolutions in favour of vegetarianism while the wolf remains of a different opinion." Take the wolf's attitude to chemical warfare:

After World War II, we unilaterally discarded our stocks of chemical weapons — principally poison gas. The factories which made them were dismantled. As last year's statement on the Defence Estimates observed, no chemical agents have been produced, nor have any new munitions been filled, since 1969. The same document, however, informs us that the Soviet Union has a stock-pile "in excess of 300,000 tonnes of chemical agent," and there is some evidence of field trials of its chemical weapons in occupied Afghanistan. So is there any reason to believe Msgr. Kent's shock-troops when they claim the Russians would behave differently over nuclear weapons?

Myth And Reality

In all the debates and speeches and articles and so forth about nuclear weapons, scant attention appears to have been paid to what we believe should be of paramount concern: the existence of an independent *British* deterrent. The only logical outcome of the present argument, which hinges essentially on whether we discard unilaterally our missiles or increasingly accept a servile role as a forward launching pad for American controlled Cruise missiles, will be greater concentration of power in fewer hands, the totality of that power remaining unchanged.

Our suspicion that this is the plan was reinforced on hearing a C.N.D.-supporting left-wing Labour M.P. state at a meeting that as far as he was concerned, the best argument for unilateral disarmament lay in the desirability of restricting the possession of nuclear weapons to the United States and the Soviet Union. The hideous coalition of fellow-travellers, Communist dupes, sentimental Christians and sheer bloody oddities who have congregated at the perimeter fence of the Greenham Common base undoubtedly imagine that they are the spearhead of a serious political protest. However, we prefer to believe that their campaign provides a convenient smokescreen behind which the makers of world policy are scheming for the victims' complicity in their own enslavement.

HOSTAGE TO CONSPIRACY

by HUGH McNEILE

Much has been written by revisionist historians, like Charles Beard, on the shrouded circumstances in which the United States was dragged into the Second World War by a President who had secured his re-election in 1940 on a pledge that America would stay out of any European conflict. So effectively has the historical black-out been penetrated that countless Americans are now aware that Franklin Roosevelt used unconstitutional means at every turn, and every convenient lie and subterfuge, to involve their country in war while keeping up the repeated assurances that "no mother's son would be sent abroad to fight". The Pearl Harbour story does not need repeating: Roosevelt did everything to bring that attack on his own unsuspecting countrymen. He was fidgety for the news of it — and jubilant when it came.

Churchill's Complicity

Attempts to dispel the orthodoxy that has surrounded Churchill's war-mongering for the last forty years have not been as far-reaching. So it was with interest and delight that I watched a BBC-TV *Newsnight* programme on December 3rd feature an interview with Tyler Kent. The accompanying commentary was tentative and partial, as was the reporter's article in *The Times* on the following morning. Nevertheless, both revealed to the public eye previously concealed aspects of Churchill's behaviour at the outbreak of war, although I imagine they were quite familiar to anyone who possesses the book written in 1946 by John Howland Snow entitled *The Case Of Tyler Kent*.

For those whose knowledge is vague, Tyler Kent was a coding clerk at the American Embassy in London before and at the outbreak of war. Among the messages he decoded was evidence of an intrigue behind the back of the then Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, between Winston Churchill and President Roosevelt. Cables read by Kent showed that Churchill was soliciting aid in the event of the United States going to war. They persuaded him that the First Lord of the Admiralty and the American President were conducting nothing less than a plot to defeat the policy first of one country and then of another. He started collecting a file of the relevant documents with the intention, he maintained later, of bringing them before Congress — 1940 was Roosevelt's election year.

Kent also approached Captain Archibald Ramsay, a patriotic Tory back-bench MP who had formed the anti-Communist and anti-Jewish Right Club. Ramsay visited Kent's flat four or five times to

inspect his haul of papers. Although the MP thought the exchanges might be made the subject of a Parliamentary Question, according to David Irving in *Focal Point* fifteen months ago, there was not sufficient hard evidence of improper actions by Churchill for him to be reported to the Prime Minister, I wonder. John Howland Snow's book quoted a letter from Kent's mother to a Senator Bridges which related one message that had been sent by Churchill: "I am half-American and the natural person to work with you. It is evident we see eye to eye. Were I to become Prime Minister of Britain we could control the world."

Churchill supplanted Neville Chamberlain as Prime Minister on May 10th, 1940. Ten days later, M15 swooped and Tyler Kent was arrested and thrown in jail. In the same week Scotland Yard used Defence Regulation 18b to round up nearly 2,000 opponents of Churchill's war policy, including Captain Ramsay. Interestingly, the man in charge of the internment exercise was Lord Rothschild, who was later to be a friend and patron of Guy Burgess.

Iniquitously, Ramsay was detained without trial until 1944. Kent and his friend Anna de Wolkoff were held in-communicado and tried in secret at the Old Bailey in October, 1940. Roosevelt, who beat Wendell Wilkie for the presidency on November 5th, was thus spared the embarrassment of any sensational disclosures during his election campaign. Chamberlain, evidently, gathered from other quarters something of the background to the intrigues which swept him from office. James Forrestall, the US Secretary of the Navy who mysteriously "fell" from a skyscraper window in New York, revealed in his *Diaries* that the American Ambassador in London told him that Chamberlain had complained that "America and the world Jews" forced Britain into war.

The re-publication this year of *The Case Of Tyler Kent* by Historical Review Press* will help in eventually securing as full a revelation of the Kent affair as we have witnessed of the Pearl Harbour treachery and the "Holocaust". While he is alive, Tyler Kent will continue to give his convincing personal account of the events that led to his incarceration for five years. This trenchant, forthright character certainly stopped in his tracks the *Newsnight* interviewer who asked him why he was "anti-semitic". "Well, the Jews are basically responsible for the establishment of world communism, aren't they?"

**The Case Of Tyler Kent* is available from H.R.P., 19A Madeira Place, Brighton, Sussex price £2.

INTO ACTION

The League of Empire Loyalists pledged at its founding to work to secure four broad objectives. These were the "maintenance and, where necessary, the recovery of the sovereign independence of the British peoples throughout the world"; the "strengthening of the spiritual and materials bonds" between them; the "conscientious development of the British Colonial Empire under British direction and local British leadership"; and the "resurgence at home and abroad of the British spirit". In addition to amplifying these general principles each week in *Candour*, A. K. Chesterton produced three *Sound The Alarm* booklets between August and October 1954 which set out the League's case that the British Empire was under attack.

Conventional Activities

In the twelve months following the League's first A.G.M. in October 1954, its campaigning was not unconventional for a political pressure group. The autumn of that year saw Loyalists picket Anglo-American study group meetings organised by the *Daily Express* and distribute leaflets attacking Lord Beaverbrook's call for the promotion of better "Transatlantic understanding". The Conservative Party's annual conference at Blackpool was also visited by leafletters. Some half a million pamphlets and leaflets were to be distributed in the League's first fifteen months. Speakers engaged in a number of debates with representatives of world government pressure groups, including a Labour M.P., for of crucial concern at this time was the proposed revision of the United Nations Charter in 1956. A very real danger existed that the occasion would be used to usher in a new supra-national institution with the power to incorporate all armed forces into a world police force. Ordinary League members were encouraged to join the Conservative Commonwealth Council in order to spread their views and win new supporters. The L.E.L. held some meetings of its own on issues related to the imperial case, and when a hurricane devastated parts of Ontario, an appeal raised £100 for the relief fund. A few meetings organised by internationalist groups like the European Movement attracted League hecklers.

Sustained effort was put into a campaign launched in Lancashire against G.A.T.T. — the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. It began in Liverpool, where the League had an active branch, and

was taken to Blackburn, Bolton, Bury, Preston and Rochdale. Preston also boasted a nucleus of Loyalists. Leaders of the cotton industry in the north-west had already spoken out about G.A.T.T.'s harmful effects in allowing foreign-made goods to flood into Britain, so fertile ground was believed to exist for the League to gain some influential recruits. A team from London spent all of March 1955 addressing meetings, distributing leaflets, fly-posting, inserting advertisements in the press and generally doing everything they could to get the League into the cotton industry's eye. A determined attempt was made to build a solid base of support in the region. Success, however, was elusive, for the only positive response came from small shop-keepers who happily displayed Loyalist literature. Manufacturers to a man shortsightedly preferred to rely on their rather ineffectual trade associations to protect their livelihoods. Efforts in later years to appeal to businessmen's vested interests — as well as those of the nation — over the issue of Common Market membership met with similar disappointment.

Little hope was offered even at this early stage in the League's existence that it would be able to exert any decisive influence within the Conservative Party by means of conventional lobbying. *Candour* revealed that efforts were underway to malign and discredit the L.E.L. in the form of a secret Central Office document distributed to branch and ward committees via constituency agents. This described the League as allegedly "subversive of the principles of Conservatism . . . anti-Semitic . . . semi-Fascist . . . [and] anti-American". A. K. Chesterton particularly objected to the accusation of Fascism — made on the basis of his own association with Mosley twenty years before — when he could point to a number of Conservative candidates and at least one M.P. who had also supported the Blackshirt cause. Posters bearing the statement "Thou Shalt Not Bear False Witness" appeared one subsequent morning plastered on the walls of the Tory Party Chairman's Sussex estate and the Party's bookshop in central London.

In the 1955 General Election, League members felt no hesitation in intervening forcefully at Conservative as well as Labour meetings. But their main activity was to supply a questionnaire to most Parliamentary candidates asking them whether or

not they would pledge support for various League viewpoints on Communism, the Middle East, coloured immigration, G.A.T.T., the H-Bomb, U.N.E.S.C.O., etc. The first, all-important question asked: "Will you honour the M.P.'s oath 'to bear true allegiance to Her Sovereign Majesty Queen Elizabeth' by opposing attempts to subordinate the British Crown and People to any supra-national authority, whether it be European Union or World Government?" Only six of the candidates elected gave an unequivocal "yes" to this, and verbal assents were received from four others. Singled out for particular attention as a result of his answers was Nigel Nicholson, the successful Conservative candidate for Bournemouth East and Christchurch. He refused to support practically every point put forward by the League and in answer to the oath question wrote: "I believe we should aim at eventual World Government through regional arrangements." Nicholson was not allowed to forget his treasonable reply. At the Conservative Party Conference that year he was interrupted in his speech by Leslie Greene and, three years later, was the subject of a great deal of League opposition within his constituency.

Loyalists and *Candour* readers had been urged at the start of the election campaign to abstain from voting in the vast majority of constituencies, but it was the hostile or indifferent answers which were received from so many Parliamentary candidates which, perhaps, provided the catalyst making A. K. Chesterton lose what small faith he might have had in the possibility of exerting conventional pressure on the Conservative Party to force a change of policy vis-a-vis the Empire. A year earlier, A.K. had written how Tory M.P.s were "a poor, tame, gutless bunch . . . lacking in conviction or principle" — how like their counterparts on the "Right" of the Conservative Party today! During the mid-fifties there was some unofficial contact with a few back-benchers like Sir Harry Legge-Bourke and Captain Henry Kerby, but A.K.'s assessment was that they would always lack the courage to make a public stand against their party whips. As for the bulk of the Conservatives, the General Election showed they had formed with the Socialists and Liberals a "united front to denigrate patriotism". Only the League, *Candour* and Britons (the veteran patriotic publishing company) were left organising the defence of Britain's national integrity.

Impact And Panache

It was the League's realisation that, politically, it stood very much alone that led its leaders to pioneer a technique of demonstration which, for sheer audacity, forced attention upon itself and placed the

movement firmly in the national headlines time and time again. More conventional activities were still pursued, like members writing letters to the press and their M.P.s about different issues each month, or sending speakers to address sixth-form and university audiences. In 1955 and 1956 an essay competition for school-children was sponsored on subjects related to the League's principles, which led to screams of anger in Parliament from Left-wing Labour M.P.s. But increasingly the League's activities involved an element of panache which was designed for maximum public impact. A. K. Chesterton believed that few people would bother to enquire into the League's case if it did not thus impinge itself upon their consciousness.

The new tactics were first used on United Nations Day in October 1955. At a ceremony in Trafalgar Square, presided over by Defence Minister Selwyn Lloyd and attended by various youth organisations, League members managed to haul down the U.N. flag from a special flag-pole and trample it in the mud. League loud-speaker vans toured the Square blaring out slogans and the strains of *Rule Britannia*. The intervention resulted in headline publicity in home and overseas newspapers, as well as on television. Even more resulted from a big Conservative Party rally at Bradford addressed by the Prime Minister, Sir Anthony Eden, in January of the following year. While he was speaking, Leslie Greene, who had already secured by bluff a seat on the platform, walked up to him with all the appearance of bringing an urgent message. As he leaned an ear to her lips, she shouted into the microphone: "The British Empire is the greatest force for peace the world has ever known and you are throwing it away." Stewards hustled her out, but other Loyalists carried on interrupting Eden's speech and leaflets were showered around the hall. The front-page publicity gained in all newspapers brought tangible gains for the League: *Candour* reported an increase in membership and enquiries poured in from all over the country.

At first, some League leaders had not shared A.K.'s confidence in the value of the dramatic clash as a means of focussing public attention on the movement and thus building support, but after these initial activities they changed their minds. Certainly, an all-out effort was put into the next campaign of protest, which was directed at the official visit to Britain of the Russian tyrants, Bulganin and Khrushchev, in April 1956. It was launched in the preceding month when another Communist leader, Malenkov, paid a preliminary visit. A League loud-speaker van trailed him from Heathrow for ten

miles broadcasting protests. Further broadcasts, demanding "Keep the Red Beasts out of Britain" and interspersed with bars of Chopin's *Funeral March*, were made in London, Bristol and towns in Yorkshire and Lancashire. Two leaflets were distributed by the thousand, detailing the Communist dictators' reign of terror.

On the day Bulganin and Khrushchev arrived and throughout their visit, League protests were ever-present. At Victoria Station, just as Eden greeted his guests, Leslie Greene and Colin Jordan announced over an amplifier: "Sir Anthony Eden has just shaken hands with murder." They were immediately arrested and fined a hefty £20 each. Other Loyalists in the crowd handed out leaflets saying: "WANTED FOR MURDER: Bulganin and Khrushchev. Information about these criminals should be sent to 10 Downing Street, where nothing is known about them." Austen Brooks, Phil Burbridge and Derek Soames had already delivered a 10ft.-long wooden spoon to Downing Street, accompanied by a note saying they feared "it will not prove long enough at Thursday's dinner party" — a reference to the adage that he who sups with the Devil must have a long spoon. The dinner party was held at the Royal Naval College, Greenwich. Despite a strong police presence, a Loyalist managed to hide himself on the Isle of Dogs across the river and broadcast a warning that the Russians were here "to disrupt the Empire". When they travelled to the Midlands, League protesters dogged their steps continuously through visits to Birmingham, Coventry and Leicester.

One consequence of the League's campaign was the resignation of Martin Burdett-Coutts as its Chairman. He claimed he objected to the nature of slogans like "Keep the Red Beasts out", but a far more likely reason was strong opposition from his banking family and business associates to his League Membership. Lt. Col. David Fraser-Harris became the new Chairman, but although wholly dedicated to the cause, he was isolated in his Cornwall home from the centre of L.E.L. activities, so A. K. Chesterton became the movement's *de facto* leader and made his influence on its tactics complete.

Endless Skirmishes

League heckling at political meetings flew thick and fast in the next few months, ensuring that the movement's name was kept firmly in the public's mind. Regular attendance at opponents' meetings was helped by the compilation of a register of activists who would be willing to travel up to a hundred miles in an evening. The only newspaper

which consistently avoided mentioning the L.E.L. was the *Daily Express*. A.K. accused Lord Beaverbrook of operating a 'black-list' and, in protest, sent a van to tour the 'paper's environs in Fleet Street and the streets around the Beaver's London residence broadcasting protests. On another occasion, a couple of Loyalists armed with an amplifier gained access to the *Express* news-room and broadcast a message to the Editor.

At this time, the L.E.L. began a series of skirmishes with the main Left-wing pressure group of the 1950s, the Movement for Colonial Freedom. Indeed, at a Central Hall, Westminster, meeting in June 1956, violence flared. The fighting broke out after continuous interruptions of a speech by Anthony Wedgwood Benn. Colin Jordan was hit on the head with a shoe by a black steward, while Austen Brooks was dragged from his seat by his tie. Two other League members were kicked and punched by M.C.F. thugs till police intervened. Succeeding speakers, however, continued to face a barrage of criticism. Fenner Brockway, the M.C.F. Chairman, bleated afterwards that the League had set out to prevent the orderly continuation of his meeting, but Austen countered him by asserting that freedom of speech "did not consist of the putting of one side only of a case, with the other side being silenced by violence." A.K. weighed in, describing Brockway as a "pestilential renegade and scab". He personally led a team of hecklers to the next M.C.F. rally, promising a very ugly scene if black stewards were again used to eject hecklers. On that occasion, however, Brockway's followers used nothing stronger than abuse to answer the League's case.

Sir Anthony Eden had his face-to-face acquaintance with the League renewed the same month at a Conservative Party fete at Warwick Castle when John Bean made his way through the crowd saying he had a presentation for the Prime Minister. The parcel he had under his arm, which he unwrapped as he advanced, turned out to be a coal-scuttle — an allusion to the Tories' scuttling of the Empire — and it was handed to Eden with the words, "In view of the development of your Empire policies, I present you with this scuttle on behalf of the League of Empire Loyalists." The Government's evacuations of British troops from the Canal Zone in Egypt was to attract what *The Observer* called "ungentlemanly calls" from League hecklers at the October Tory Party Conference. But on television, Christopher Chataway gave the League credit for voicing the objections of opponents of this particular policy.

The highspot of the League's activities in the

autumn of 1956 was the successful seizure of the United Nations flag on U.N. Day for the second year running. Despite security precautions involving dozens of policemen, the ceremony was turned into a fiasco. Let the November 2nd issue of *Candour* tell what happened.

"United Nations officials, uniformed police and plainclothes men were thick on the ground. Two police 'Black Marias' were drawn up close to the scene as a grim warning to would-be demonstrators. The entrances to the enclosures were closely guarded. Everything, it seemed, was safely 'tied up'.

"Before the cadets and other youth movement contingents marched into the enclosure a man in the uniform of a Merchant Marine officer presented himself at one of the entrances. He was warmly welcomed. He was even introduced to the Commissioner of Police. 'You will be from Trinity House,' said an official. 'We are so glad that you have been able to come to help us with unfurling our flag.' The man in the Marine officer's uniform was taken to the flagpole, where he calmly adjusted the U.N. flag before hoisting it to the mast-top, where it was to be unfurled by Mr. Turton, the Minister of Health.

"After the parade had assembled, the Ministerial party arrived. Mr. Turton was heard to remark that 'Empire Loyalists are as thick as flies around here'. After being introduced, he made a long speech praising U.N. 'achievements' to his bored audience of boys and girls, and then stepped forward to unfurl the flag. 'Parade, 'shun,' rang out the word of command. The Minister gave a tug. The flag wobbled but did not unfurl. Another tug, another wobble. Perhaps five or six tugs in all, followed by five or six wobbles. Irreverently the young people on parade and the crowd outside the enclosure began to titter. The titter became a gust of laughter.

"As Mr. Turton in despair gave up tugging, a voice in his ear said: 'Leave it to me sir.' The voice belonged to the obliging man in the Merchant Marine uniform. He brought the flag down and on the instant strode with it, in front of the entire parade, to throw it upon the pavement near where the Editor of *Candour* was standing. 'I do not know if you want to do anything about this filthy rag, A.K.,' he said. The man in the Merchant Marine uniform was none other than Mr. Philip Burbidge of the League of Empire Loyalists. The League had done it again!"

To be continued.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Madam — I was delighted to see an article by Admiral Domville in your October issue.

The Masons have always puzzled me. I cannot understand how any mature man could ever have believed the nonsense about Solomon's Temple, Jebulo, Jebula and Jebulum, etc., but evidently some did in the past, or they would not have murdered Captain Morgan to preserve their "secrets". A friend of mine, who went as far as the 32nd degree (i.e. as far as one can go without a special invitation to join the really secret 33rd degree), was certain the lodges now were just devices to milk the suckers. Even so, I cannot understand how a mature man could join. If someone tried to initiate me into one of their degrees, there would be a hell of a row in the lodge and, I hope, one or two of the brethren would have broken jaws.

Anyway, I agree with a pair of adolescent girls who happened to have a chance to spy on a meeting of a Masonic lodge and couldn't tell one about it without giggling uncontrollably at the recollection of how supremely silly grown men could be. —
REVILO P. OLIVER.

Editor's note: The issue of Freemasonry is one on which we have to differ with our founder, A. K. Chesterton. In our view, the Craft must be opposed not only because of its centuries-old links with subversive movements, but also for the reason that its primary objective was and is the de-Christianisation of human society. As the Abbé Georges de Nantes puts it in his *150 Points of the Phalange*, Masonry's intention is to "substitute Jesus Christ with Man himself, whereby each man can recognise and idolize himself in the idea of Man, man who makes himself God". The abundance of serious literature by writers like the Vicomte de Poncins, the Rev. Walton Hannah or Father Fahey makes it impossible, to our minds, for any patriot to be able to ignore or deny the truth concerning the menace of Freemasonry.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Subscribe Today !

U.K. £4.00

Overseas airmail £4.50

U.S.A. Dollar Rate \$10.00

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD